2005 NAIP Survey
Executive Summary
For
Washington

USDA
Farm Service Agency

Aerial Photography Field Office

March 2006

Contents

Section 1

1.0 Introduction

The primary purpose of NAIP is to acquire peak growing season "leaf on" imagery, and deliver this imagery to United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) County Service Centers in order to maintain Common Land Unit (CLU) boundaries and assist with crop compliance and a multitude of other farm programs.

As evidenced by the types of customers requesting NAIP imagery, the imagery has other purposes as well. Although our primary customers are States and County Service Centers, other uses for NAIP imagery, including military, real estate, recreation, planning, etc., cannot be overlooked.

NAIP is a program with a relatively short history, beginning with pilot projects in 2001 and 2002, and moving to full volume acquisition in 2003 to 2005, based on funding and partnering. NAIP is moving out of the research and development phase and into sustainment status. By moving into a sustainment phase, a program can build and evaluate a quality business process, and stabilize. Part of this process is evaluating how NAIP is working for its primary customers.

1.1 Purpose and Scope

The focus of this document is to assess in a qualitative manner how NAIP is satisfying customer needs in Washington. In other words, "How did APFO do in providing *useful* NAIP imagery for its primary customer?" Answering this question comprises the purpose and scope.

1.2 Survey Submittals

For the initial disposition, the following States were sent surveys to disseminate to County Service Centers for completion: **WA**, OR, OK, KS, NE, MO, IA, MN, WI, IL, IN, OH, CT, and NC. No responses were received from KS or AZ by the 15 Dec 2005 due date. WA noted that they would respond to the survey, but due to imagery delivery/redelivery dates, responses would likely be after 15 Dec.

A second waive of surveys was sent to the following States to disseminate to County Service Centers for completion: CA, CO, MT, ND, SD, TX, LA, MS, AL, GA, FL, SC, VA, MD, PA, MI, RI, and CT. Responses were requested by 17 Feb, and by 9 Mar for select states which received imagery "late". Surveys were accidentally sent to CT twice, however, County Service Centers only responded once. LA noted that they would only be able to get a few Counties to complete the survey by the 9 Mar due date. MI noted they would not be able to participate in the survey because of CIR rework that would be completed after the survey due date. MT noted that due to the late distribution of imagery, surveys would likely be returned after the 9 Mar due date. During the second waive of surveys, no survey responses were received by CO, GA, MI, or AL. Surveys received after 9 Mar 06 were not scored.

Section 2

2.0 Qualitative Evaluation Summary

NAIP Assessment Surveys were provided by email to County Service Centers via the State Office and responses were requested by 15 Dec 05. Out of the responses received, in Washington, 1137 of a possible 1520 points were achieved, for a weighted average score out of 1.0 of .748, for a rating of 74.8%. Translated into survey terms, this is an overall rating of "Satisfied". The map on the following page graphically represents overall survey results by county. These results indicate that generally the counties that participated in the survey were satisfied with 2005 NAIP and that the products met customer needs most of the time. However, there is room for improvement.

Most textual comments from the survey revolved around timing of imagery delivery. Textual comments can be found in the Executive Summary Supplementals 1 and 2. A statistical summary by question of survey results is shown below. Note that Q1-8 are out of a possible 5 points and Q9-10 are out of a possible 10 points. Statistically, the lowest average scoring question was Q1, "Was the imagery received by your office in time to be useful for crop compliance work?" Statistically, the highest scoring question was Q3, "Is the imagery useful for CLU certification, including corrections/change detection/validation?"

Q1		*Q2*		*Q3*		*Q4*		*Q5*	
Mean	2.48	Mean	3.923076923	Mean	4.692307692	Mean	4.576923077	Mean	4.608695652
Standard Error	0.154056267	Standard Error	0.123076923	Standard Error	0.092307692	Standard Error	0.168002536	Standard Error	0.121569617
Median	2	Median	4	Median	5	Median	5	Median	5
Mode	2	Mode	4	Mode	5	Mode	5	Mode	5
Standard Deviation	0.770281334	Standard Deviation	0.627571632	Standard Deviation	0.470678724	Standard Deviation	0.856648209	Standard Deviation	0.5830274
Sample Variance	0.593333333	Sample Variance	0.393846154	Sample Variance	0.221538462	Sample Variance	0.733846154	Sample Variance	0.339920949
Kurtosis	-0.133008119	Kurtosis	-0.203538978	Kurtosis	-1.324728261	Kurtosis	12.19372514	Kurtosis	0.684153597
Skewness	0.07229989	Skewness	0.049795112	Skewness	-0.885246443	Skewness	-3.153287234	Skewness	-1.216584891
Range	3	Range	2	Range	1	Range	4	Range	2
Minimum	1	Minimum	3	Minimum	4	Minimum	1	Minimum	3
Maximum	4	Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	5
Sum	62	Sum	102	Sum	122	Sum	119	Sum	106
Count	25	Count	26	Count	26	Count	26	Count	23

Q6		*Q7*		*Q8*		*Q9_X2*		*Q10_X2*	
Mean	3.730769231	Mean	4.5	Mean	4.653846154	Mean	6	Mean	5.846153846
Standard Error	0.269230769	Standard Error	0.157771274	Standard Error	0.135218429	Standard Error	0.332820118	Standard Error	0.349471283
Median	4	Median	5	Median	5	Median	6	Median	6
Mode	4	Mode	5	Mode	5	Mode	8	Mode	4
Standard Deviation	1.372812946	Standard Deviation	0.74001287	Standard Deviation	0.68948141	Standard Deviation	1.697056275	Standard Deviation	1.781960891
Sample Variance	1.884615385	Sample Variance	0.547619048	Sample Variance	0.475384615	Sample Variance	2.88	Sample Variance	3.175384615
Kurtosis	-0.282509824	Kurtosis	-0.019221968	Kurtosis	1.843389739	Kurtosis	-1.630434783	Kurtosis	-1.774901827
Skewness	-0.978773891	Skewness	-1.163317018	Skewness	-1.795355261	Skewness	3.84877E-17	Skewness	0.158783359
Range	4	Range	2	Range	2	Range	4	Range	4
Minimum	1	Minimum	3	Minimum	3	Minimum	4	Minimum	4
Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	8	Maximum	8
Sum	97	Sum	99	Sum	121	Sum	156	Sum	152
Count	26	Count	22	Count	26	Count	26	Count	26

2005 NAIP - Overall Qualitative Survey Results